SCIENCE CHINA
Physics, Mechanics & Astronomy

Vol. No. :
doi:

arXiv:1701.02226v1 [quant-ph] 9 Jan 2017

Uncertainty Relation Based on Skew Information with Quantum Memory

Zhihao Ma[1], Zhihua Chen[2], and Shao-Ming Fei*[3,4]

[1] *School of Mathematical Sciences, Shanghai Jiaotong University, Shanghai, 200240, China*
[2] *Department of Applied Mathematics, Zhejiang University of Technology, Hangzhou, 310014, China*
[3] *School of Mathematical Sciences, Capital Normal University, Beijing 100048, China*
4 Max-Planck-Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences, 04103 Leipzig, Germany

PACS number(s): 03.67.-a, 75.10.Pq, 03.67.Mn

Dear Editors,

Uncertainty principle is one of the most fascinating features of the quantum world. It asserts a fundamental limit on the precision with which certain pairs of physical properties of a particle, such as position and momentum, can not be simultaneously known. The uncertainty principle has attracted considerable attention since the innovation of quantum mechanics and has been investigated in terms of various types of uncertainty inequalities: as informational recourses in entropic terms, by means of majorization technique and based on sum of variances and standard deviations.

For a pair of observables R and S, the well-known Heisenberg-Robertson uncertainty relation [1] says that, $V_\rho(R).V_\rho(S) \geqslant \frac{1}{4}|\mathrm{Tr}\rho\,[R,S]|^2$, where $[R,S] = RS - SR$ is the commutator and $V_\rho(R)$ is the standard deviation of R. The entropies serve as appropriate measures of the information content. It is also used to quantify the quantum uncertainty: the sum of the Shannon entropy of the probability distribution of the outcomes is no less than $\log_2 \frac{1}{c}$ [2] when R and S are measured. The term $1/c$ quantifies the complementarity of the two observables R and S. It has been proved that the entropy uncertainty relations do imply the Heisenberg's uncertainty relation.

Concerning bipartite systems, the authors in [3] provided a bound on the uncertainties which depends on the amount of entanglement between the measured particle A and the quantum memory B. The result of [3] was further improved to depend on the quantum discord between particles A and B in [4]. Recently the authors in [5] obtained entropic uncertainty relations for multiple measurements with quantum memory.

The quantum uncertainty relation can be also described in terms of skew information. $I(\rho,H) = -\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}\left[\sqrt{\rho},H\right]^2$ is introduced to quantify the degree of non-commutativity of a state ρ and an observable H, which is reduced to the variance $V_\rho(H)$ when ρ is a pure state [6]. It can be interpreted as quantum uncertainty of H in ρ. Luo introduced another quantity in [7], $J_\rho(H) = \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}[(\{\sqrt{\rho},H_0\})^2]$, where $\{X,Y\}$ is the anti-commutator, $H_0 = H - \mathrm{Tr}(\rho H)I$ with I the identity operator. The following inequality holds [7],

$$\sqrt{I(\rho,R)\,J_\rho(R)}\,\sqrt{I(\rho,S)\,J_\rho(S)} \geqslant \frac{1}{4}|\mathrm{Tr}(\rho[R,S])|^2. \quad (1)$$

$\sqrt{I(\rho,R)\,J_\rho(R)}$ can be regarded as a kind of measure for quantum uncertainty. Hence we define $\mathcal{UN}(\rho,R) := \sqrt{I(\rho,R)\,J_\rho(R)}$. Then we define the uncertainty of ρ associated to the projective measurement $\{\phi_k\}$ as: $\mathcal{UN}(\rho)_{\{\phi_k\}} = \sum_k \mathcal{UN}(\rho,\phi_k) = \sum_k \sqrt{I(\rho,\phi_k)\,J_\rho(\phi_k)}$, where $\phi_k = |\phi_k\rangle\langle\phi_k|$ and $\psi_k = |\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k|$ are the rank one spectral projectors of two non-degenerate observables R and S with eigenvectors $|\phi_k\rangle$ and $|\psi_k\rangle$, respectively.

Now we consider the case of bipartite state ρ_{AB} in tensor space $H_A \otimes H_B$ [8]. Recall that quantum discord is a kind of quantum correlation that is different from the entanglement and has found many novel applications [9]. A bipartite state ρ_{AB} is of zero discord if and only if it is a classical-quantum correlated state (CQ state). Besides the definition of the original discord, there are some other discord-like measures sharing the same properties such that their values are zero iff the state is a CQ state. In this letter we define another discord-like measure. Let O be any orthogonal basis space in Hilbert space H_A. Let $|\phi_k\rangle$ be an orthogonal basis of H_A and $\phi_k = |\phi_k\rangle\langle\phi_k|$ the orthogonal projections on H_A. We define the quantum correlation of ρ_{AB} as:

$$Q\left(\rho^{AB}\right) = \min_O \sum_k [I(\rho^{AB},\phi_k\otimes I_B) - I(\rho^A,\phi_k)], \quad (2)$$

where the minimum is taken over all the orthogonal bases in H_A, ρ^A is the reduced state of system A.

From the inequality in [10] that $I(\rho^{AB},X\otimes I) \geqslant I(\rho_A,X)$ for any bipartite state ρ^{AB} and any observable X on H^A, we have

[1] *Corresponding author (email: feishm@cnu.edu.cn)

© Science China Press and Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg

the property that $Q\left(\rho^{AB}\right) \geqslant 0$. Moreover, $Q\left(\rho^{AB}\right) = 0$ if and only if ρ_{AB} is a CQ state by using the method in proving the theorem 1, property (1) of [11].

$Q\left(\rho^{AB}\right)$ has a term of measurement on the subsystem A, which gives an explicit physical meaning: it is the minimal difference of incompatibility of the projective measurements on the bipartite state ρ^{AB} and on the local reduced state ρ^{A}. It quantifies the quantum correlations between the subsystems A and B.

Theorem Let ρ^{AB} be a quantum state on $H_A \otimes H_B$, $\{\phi_k\}$ and $\{\psi_k\}$ denote two sets of rank one projective measurements on H^A. Then the following uncertainty relation holds:

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{UN}\left(\rho^{AB}\right)_{\{\phi_k\otimes I^B\}} + \mathcal{UN}\left(\rho^{AB}\right)_{\{\psi_k\otimes I^B\}} \\ &\geqslant \sum_k 2L_{\rho^A}(\phi_k,\psi_k) + 2Q\left(\rho^{AB}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

where $L_{\rho^A}(\phi_k,\psi_k) = \frac{1}{4}|\mathrm{Tr}(\rho^A[\phi_k,\psi_k])|^2 / \sqrt{J_{\rho^A}(\phi_k)J_{\rho^A}(\psi_k)}$.

Proof. By definition we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{UN}\left(\rho^{AB}\right)_{\{\phi_k\otimes I^B\}} + \mathcal{UN}\left(\rho^{AB}\right)_{\{\psi_k\otimes I^B\}} \\ &\geqslant \sum_k I\left(\rho^{AB},\phi_k\otimes I^B\right) + \sum_k I\left(\rho^{AB},\psi_k\otimes I^B\right) \\ &= \sum_k I\left(\rho^{A},\phi_k\right) + \sum_k I\left(\rho^{A},\psi_k\right) + \sum_k [I\left(\rho^{AB},\phi_k\otimes I^B\right) \\ &-I\left(\rho^{A},\phi_k\right)] + \sum_k [I\left(\rho^{AB},\psi_k\otimes I^B\right) - I\left(\rho^{A},\psi_k\right)] \\ &\geqslant \sum_k 2\sqrt{I\left(\rho^{A},\phi_k\right) I\left(\rho^{A},\psi_k\right)} + \sum_k [I\left(\rho^{AB},\phi_k\otimes I^B\right) \\ &-I\left(\rho^{A},\phi_k\right)] + \sum_k [I\left(\rho^{AB},\psi_k\otimes I^B\right) - I\left(\rho^{A},\psi_k\right)] \\ &\geqslant \sum_k 2L_{\rho^A}(\phi_k,\psi_k) + 2Q\left(\rho^{AB}\right). \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

The first inequality holds since $I(\rho,R) \leqslant J_\rho(R)$ (see [12]). The second inequality is due to the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. The final inequality holds because the optimal measurement for $Q\left(\rho^{AB}\right)$ may not be ϕ_k or ψ_k.

From the theorem, we obtain an uncertainty relation in the form of sum of skew information, which is in some sense similar to the result in the recent work [13]. But actually our result is quite different from that in [13], which only deals with single partite case. We treat the bipartite case with a quantum memory B. Interestingly, the lower bound contains two terms, one term is the quantum correlation $Q\left(\rho^{AB}\right)$, the other term is $\sum_k L_{\rho^A}(\phi_k,\psi_k)$ which characterizes the degree of complementarity of two measurements, just as the meaning of $\log_2 \frac{1}{c}$ in the entropic uncertainty relation [3]. Therefore our result can be viewed as an analogue of the bipartite entropic uncertainty relation.

As an example, we consider the 2-qubit Werner state $\rho = \frac{2-p}{6} I_4 + \frac{2p-1}{6} V$, where $p \in [-1,1]$ and $V = \sum_{kl} |kl\rangle\langle kl|$. Take σ_x and σ_z as the two observables. For our theorem we have the values of the left hand side and the right hand side of (3), $\frac{\sqrt{5-2\sqrt{3-3p^2}-2p(1-p+\sqrt{3-3p^2})}}{3}$ and $\frac{2-p-\sqrt{3-3p^2}}{3}$, respectively. While the left hand side of the theorem in [7] is $\frac{1}{9}(2-p-\sqrt{3-3p^2})(4+p+\sqrt{3-3p^2})$ and the right hand side is 0. From the result in [4], the left hand side is $-\frac{2(2-p)}{3}\log_2\frac{2-p}{6} - \frac{2(1+p)}{3}\log_2\frac{1+p}{6} - 2$, the bound is the same as the left hand side, see Fig. 1 for comparision.



Figure 1 Axe y is the uncertainty and its lower bound. The result in [4] is represented by blue thick line, the corresponding lower bound is represented by blue dotted line; the result in [7] is represented by green dotdashed line, the lower bound is 0; the left hand side of our theorem is represented by blue dashed line and the lower bound of our theorem is represented by red line.

In summary, we have established a new uncertainty relation based on the skew information. We studied the case of uncertainty relation with the existence of a quantum memory for the bipartite quantum system. Our result shows that quantum correlations can be used to obtain a tighter bound of uncertainty.

Zhihao Ma and Zhihua Chen thank Davide Girolami for useful discussions. This work is supported by NSFC under numbers 11275131, 11371247, 11571313 and 11675113.

1 W. Heisenberg, *Z. Phys,* 43, 172 (1927).
2 H. Maassen, J. B. M. Uffink, *Phys. Rev. Lett.,* 60, 1103 (1988).
3 M. Berta, et al, *Nature Physics,* 6, 659(2010).
4 A. K. Pati, A. R. Usha Devi, A. K. Rajagopal, et al, *Phys. Rev. A,* 86, 042105 (2012).
5 S. Liu, L.-Z. Mu, and H. Fan, *Phys. Rev. A,* **91**, 042133 (2015).
6 E. P. Wigner, M. M. Yanase, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.,* 49, 910 (1963).
7 S. Luo, *Phys. Rev. A,* 72,042110 (2005).
8 A. Uhlmann,*Science China Physics, Mechanics and Astronomy*, 59(3), 630301 (2016).
9 K. Modi, A. Brodutch, H. Cable, et al, *Rev. Mod. Phys.,* 84, 1655-1707 (2012).
10 E. H. Lieb, *Adv. Math* 11, 267 (1973).
11 S. Luo, S. Fu, C. H. Oh, *Phys. Rev. A,* 85, 032117 (2012).
12 S. Furuichi, *Phys. Rev. A,* 82, 034101(2010).
13 B. Chen, S. M. Fei, *Scientific Reports* 5, 14238(2015).